

### Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

New claim 51 has been added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 9-11, 14-16 and 25-50 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. 7,180,074 ("Crosetto"). This rejection should be withdrawn because Crosetto fails to disclose or fairly suggest every element recited in the pending claims.

Claim 1 recites an imaging system that includes, *inter alia*, at least one x-ray source rotatable with respect to a gantry and a table, wherein the at least one x-ray source is modulated for assigning a signal to the x-rays produced by the respective modulated x-ray source, and the signal is used to demodulate data from the detector array thereby to separate the data arising from detection of the modulated x-rays from data arising from scatter from another x-ray source.

In rejecting claim 1 as being anticipated by Crosetto, the Office Action makes no mention of the claim 1 recitation of an x-ray source that is modulated for assigning a signal to the x-rays produced by the respective modulated x-ray source and/or using the assigned signal to demodulate data from the detector array to separate data arising from detection of the modulated x-rays from data arising from scatter from another x-ray source, let alone apply Crosetto to this portion of claim 1.

As such, the anticipation rejection is flawed because the Office Action does not address every element of claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 9-11, 14-16 and 25-50 should be withdrawn.

In addition, Crosetto has not been found to disclose or fairly suggest an imaging system having a x-ray source that is modulated for assigning a signal to the x-rays produced by the respective modulated x-ray source, and the signal is used to demodulate data from the detector array thereby to separate the data arising from detection of the modulated x-rays from data arising from scatter from another x-ray source.

Therefore, the rejections of claim 1 and dependent claims 9-11, 14-16 and 25-50 should be withdrawn because they are not supported by Crosetto.

New claim 51 recites an imaging system that includes, *inter alia*, at least one x-ray source configured to modulate x-rays produced by the at least one x-ray source to assign a signal to the x-rays produced by the respective modulated x-ray source, and a collection system configured to use the signal to demodulate data from the detector array thereby to separate the data arising from detection of the modulated x-rays from data arising from scatter from another x-ray source.

As is discussed above with respect to claim 1, Crosetto has not been found to disclose or fairly suggest an imaging system having at least one x-ray source configured to modulate x-rays produced by the at least one x-ray source to assign a signal to the x-rays produced by the respective modulated x-ray source. In addition, Crosetto has not been found to disclose or fairly suggest a collection system configured to use the signal to demodulate data from the detector array thereby to separate the data arising from detection of the modulated x-rays from data arising from scatter from another x-ray source.

Therefore, new claim 51 should be in condition for allowance.

### ***Telephone Interview***

In the interests of advancing this application to issue and compact prosecution, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss any of the foregoing with which there may be some controversy or confusion or to make any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the application in condition for allowance.

## Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Jason A Worgull/  
Jason A. Worgull, Reg. No. 48,044

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113

M:\M\MULD\P\P0101\P0101US-R04.wpd